arXiv:hep-ph/0411090v1 5 Nov 2004

UMN-TH-2325/04
November 2004

Partly Supersymmetric Grand Unification

Tony Gherghetta

School of Physics and Astronomy
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

Abstract

It is shown how grand unification can occur in models which are partly supersymmetric. The particle states which are composite do not contribute to the running of gauge couplings above the compositeness scale, while the elementary states contribute the usual large logarithmns. This introduces a new differential running contribution to the gauge couplings from partly composite $SU(5)$ matter multiplets. In particular, for partly supersymmetric models, the incomplete $SU(5)$ elementary matter multiplets restore gauge coupling unification even though the usual elementary gaugino and Higgsino contributions need not be present.

1 Introduction

The impressive unification of the gauge couplings in the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) is touted as indirect evidence for supersymmetry at low energies. This unification results from the superpartner contribution of incomplete $SU(5)$ mulitplets, namely, the gauginos and Higgsinos. As a bonus these sparticles also provide a suitable dark matter candidate. However, the supersymmetric model generically leads to flavour, CP and gravitino/moduli problems. While elaborate mechanisms do exist that solve these problems the generic problem arises because the scale of supersymmetry breaking is low. It is tempting then to consider natural models of high-scale supersymmetry breaking.

Recently, a partly supersymmetric model [1] was constructed in which only the Higgs sector is supersymmetric. This model naturally arises in the five dimensional warped geometry [2], but has a purely four dimensional interpretation as a partly composite model. Both the Higgs and Higgsino are composite states, with the Higgsino playing the role of the dark matter candidate. All superpartners in this model (except, possibly the third generation sparticles), receive large supersymmetry breaking masses, thereby providing a simple solution to the supersymmetric flavour, CP and gravitino/moduli problems (where the gravitational sector problems require considering local supersymmetry in the bulk [3]).

However the success of the supersymmetric standard model is also measured in the precise unification of the gauge couplings. The dominant effect in the differential running comes from the gaugino and Higgsino contributions. But in the partly supersymmetric model the required gaugino contributions are not present, since these states are decoupled at low energies, and the Higgsinos (and Higgs) are composite and consequently do not contribute to the running above the TeV compositeness scale. Thus, it would seem that the impressive gauge coupling unification in the MSSM is lost.

In this paper we show that the differential running effects of the gauginos and Higgsinos are replaced in the partly supersymmetric model by those arising from part of the standard model fermions. This is because fermions in $SU(5)$ representations will be partly composite. This will be natural for the third generation fermions which have large Yukawa couplings and therefore need a large wavefunction overlap with the composite Higgs. Moreover, a composite top quark is required to trigger electroweak symmetry breaking [1]. Assuming that an $SU(5)$ GUT symmetry is broken by boundary conditions requires that the standard model fermions form part of *different* $SU(5)$ multiplets. Then, since only part of the third generation is composite, a differential effect is introduced in the running of the gauge couplings because the composite fermions do not contribute to the running above the compositeness scale. This differential effect in the gauge coupling running from fermions can help to re-

store the unification of the couplings at a high energy scale that was lost from the gauginos and Higgsinos.

In the slice of AdS_5 there is a large separation between the infrared (IR) and ultraviolet (UV) energy scales because these theories are holographically dual to a four-dimensional CFT [4, 5]. Remarkably, this leads to logarithmic running in these models [6], although the issue of gauge coupling unification is more subtle. The running above the IR (or TeV) scale $T \equiv ke^{-\pi kR}$ must be understood in terms of the Planck brane-brane correlator, and since gauge bosons live in the bulk this cannot be done with the zero mode correlator [7]. Nonetheless, at low energies, $p \leq T$, the predictions are identical because the Kaluza-Klein states do not contribute to the running, and so either correlators can be used. This is the basis for studying gauge coupling unification in warped models. In previous work, large but natural threshold corrections were used to restore grand unification in nonsupersymmetric models [8]. However in warped supersymmetric models [9] the conventional MSSM unification can be obtained [10], albeit with the usual TeV mass scale superpartners. In fact this class of models is identical to the usual MSSM coupled to a strong CFT sector which is responsible for dynamical supersymmetry breaking. Instead we will consider gauge coupling unification in natural high-scale supersymmetric models where, except for sparticles associated with the Higgs sector, the superpartners are superheavy and decoupled from low energies. In fact the idea of having part elementary matter fields contributing to the differential running of gauge couplings is quite general and we will also briefly mention other partly supersymmetric possibilities (although see Ref. [11] for a nonsupersymmetric possibility).

2 GUT breaking on the UV brane

The geometrical setting of the model is a slice of AdS_5 where the fifth dimension is compactified on an orbifold S^1/Z_2 of radius R with the metric

$$ds^2 = e^{-2k|y|}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2 \ , \tag{1}$$

where $0 \leq y \leq \pi R$, k is the AdS curvature scale, and the Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ has signature $(-+++)$. At the orbifold fixed points $y^* = 0$ and $y^* = \pi R$ there are two 3-branes, the UV (or Planck) brane and IR (or TeV) brane, respectively. Generically fermions are introduced into the five-dimensional bulk as Dirac fermions with masses $m_\Psi = ck\epsilon(y)$, where $\epsilon(y) = y/|y|$, and c is a dimensionless parameter. The zero modes of the bulk fermions are identified with the usual low energy standard model fermions. If $c > 1/2$ ($c < 1/2$) then the fermion zero mode is localised towards the Planck (TeV) brane [12].

We will assume that there is an $SU(5)$ gauge symmetry in the bulk that is broken

on the UV brane by boundary conditions. This occurs by imposing Neumann (+) or Dirichlet (−) conditions on the bulk fields corresponding to even or odd reflections, respectively, about the orbifold fixed points. The $SU(5)$ gauge bosons form an $\mathcal{N}=2$ vector multiplet $\mathcal{V}=(V,S)$, where V is an $\mathcal{N}=1$ vector multiplet and S is an $\mathcal{N}=1$ chiral multiplet with the boundary conditions

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} V_\mu^a(+,+) \\ V_\mu^A(-,+) \end{bmatrix} , \qquad S = \begin{bmatrix} S^a(-,-) \\ S^A(+,-) \end{bmatrix} , \tag{2}$$

and the indices $a(A)$ run over the unbroken (broken) generators. In particular notice that the $SU(5)$ symmetry remains unbroken on the TeV-brane, and the only zero modes in the spectrum are identified with the $SU(3)\times SU(2)\times U(1)_Y$ gauge fields. At the nonzero mode level, the X,Y gauge bosons and the $SU(5)$ adjoint scalar states obtain TeV-scale masses.

Similarly, the Higgs sector is supersymmetric and contains two Higgs doublets which are embedded into two $\mathcal{N}=2$ bulk hypermultiplets, $\mathcal{H}=(H_5,H_5^c)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}=(\bar{H}_5,\bar{H}_5^c)$, each transforming in the $\mathbf{5}$ of $SU(5)$. The boundary conditions are

$$H_5 = \begin{bmatrix} H_2(+,+) \\ H_3(-,+) \end{bmatrix} , \qquad H_5^c = \begin{bmatrix} H_2^c(-,-) \\ H_3^c(+,-) \end{bmatrix} , \tag{3}$$

and similarly for $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Thus the only zero modes are the two Higgs doublets, $H_2(+,+)$ and $\bar{H}_2(+,+)$, as in the MSSM. This choice of boundary conditions neatly solves the doublet-triplet splitting problem [13]. The fields with boundary conditions $(\mp,\pm)$ and $c<-1/2 (c>1/2)$ obtain masses of order

$$m_{(\mp,\pm)} \simeq 2\sqrt{c^2-\frac{1}{4}}k\ e^{(\pm c-\frac{1}{2})\pi kR} , \tag{4}$$

while for $c>-1/2 (c<1/2)$ their masses are

$$m_{(\mp,\pm)} \simeq k\ e^{-\pi kR} . \tag{5}$$

The standard model matter fields are also embedded into bulk $\mathcal{N}=2$ hypermultiplets. However, while it would seem natural to put all the fermions of a single generation into a single $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{10}$, parity assignments actually require the quarks and leptons to arise from different $SU(5)$ bulk hypermultiplets [14, 15, 16]. Not only does this mechanism elegantly explain why the fermions need not satisfy the $SU(5)$ mass relations, but we will see that this fact is responsible for the differential running of the gauge couplings [8]. For each generation we will suppose that there are bulk hypermultiplets $(\mathbf{5}_1,\mathbf{5}_1^c)+(\mathbf{5}_2,\mathbf{5}_2^c)$ and $(\mathbf{10}_1,\mathbf{10}_1^c)+(\mathbf{10}_2,\mathbf{10}_2^c)$ with boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{5}_1 = L_1(+,+)+d_1^c(-,+) , \quad \mathbf{5}_1^c = L_1^c(-,-)+d_1(+,-) , \tag{6}$$

$$\mathbf{5}_2 = L_2(-,+) + d_2^c(+,+) \ , \quad \mathbf{5}_2^c = L_2^c(+,-) + d_2(-,-) \ , \tag{7}$$
$$\mathbf{10}_1 = Q_1(+,+) + u_1^c(-,+) + e_1^c(-,+) \ , \tag{8}$$
$$\mathbf{10}_1^c = Q_1^c(-,-) + u_1(+,-) + e_1(+,-) \ , \tag{9}$$
$$\mathbf{10}_2 = Q_2(-,+) + u_2^c(+,+) + e_2^c(+,+) \ , \tag{10}$$
$$\mathbf{10}_2^c = Q_2^c(+,-) + u_2(-,-) + e_2(-,-) \ , \tag{11}$$

where the standard model fermions are identified with the zero modes of the fields with (+,+) boundary conditions. Notice that even though each standard model generation arises from different $\mathbf{5} + \mathbf{10}$ fields, the usual charge quantization and hypercharge assignments arising from a single $\mathbf{5} + \mathbf{10}$ are still explained [14, 15]. This feature also explains why tree-level proton decay is not a problem in these models. There is simply no coupling between X, Y gauge bosons and standard model fields L and d^c since these fields arise from different $SU(5)$ multiplets. This is also true for couplings between standard model particles and the coloured Higgs triplets. However, a bulk $U(1)$ symmetry must be introduced in order to prevent proton decay from higher-dimensional operators [10, 8].

Now in the partly supersymmetric standard model, supersymmetry is assumed to be broken on the UV (or Planck) brane. This means that fields which are coupled to the UV brane directly feel the high-scale supersymmetry breaking and decouple from the low energy spectrum. In particular, the gauginos of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ vector multiplets receive Planck scale masses. For the bulk hypermultiplets only superpartner fields with $c \gtrsim 1/2$ receive Planck scale masses, while hypermultiplets with $c \lesssim -1/2$ are insensitive to the UV supersymmetry breaking. Therefore the zero modes of bulk fields with $c \lesssim -1/2$ are the only particles in the supersymmetric sector. In the dual 4D theory these states are also seen to be composite states of the CFT, which explains why they are not sensitive to the UV supersymmetry breaking [1].

In particular the bulk Higgs hypermultiplets are assumed to have $c_H \lesssim -1/2$, which means that the Higgs is localised on the IR brane, and the Higgs sector is supersymmetric (where for simplicity $c_H = c_{\bar{H}}$). In the limit that $c_H \to -\infty$, there are two localised Higgs doublets, as well as two Higgs triplets on the TeV brane. This is consistent with the fact that the $SU(5)$ symmetry is only broken on the Planck brane. Since the Higgs is localised on the TeV brane, the hierarchies in the Yukawa couplings of the first two generations can be generated by localising these fermions towards the Planck brane, and therefore the first two generations are elementary. However, to generate the larger third generation fermion masses requires some fermions to necessarily be localised towards the TeV brane, and consequently are composite. A composite top quark is also crucial to generate radiative electroweak symmetry breaking [1]. Thus, the third generation fermion sector is naturally part elementary and part composite.

Specifically, consider the case where $c_{\mathbf{5}_1}, c_{\mathbf{10}_1} \gtrsim 1/2$, while $c_{\mathbf{5}_2}, c_{\mathbf{10}_2} \lesssim -1/2$. This

means that $Q_1(+,+)$ and $L_1(+,+)$ are localised towards the Planck brane, and are elementary fields in the 4D dual description, while $u_2^c(+,+)$, $d_2^c(+,+)$ and $e_2^c(+,+)$ are localised towards the TeV brane and are composite states. The crucial point is that since the zero modes with $c \lesssim -1/2$ are composite then they do not contribute to the running above the TeV scale, while the elementary states do. Thus, above the TeV scale the elementary standard model fermions of the third generation form an incomplete $SU(5)$ multiplet and contribute to the differential running of the gauge couplings!

Actually this is not the entire story because there are other elementary fermion contributions that arise from the bulk hypermultiplet fields with $(\pm, \mp)$ boundary conditions. Naively, these contributions arise from the fact that there should be a source field for each bulk Dirac fermion component. However, from the bulk point of view one cannot simultaneously introduce two Weyl fermion sources on the boundary because the 5D Lagrangian only contains first-order derivatives and the boundary value of one Weyl fermion always vanishes since it is odd. Nonetheless for a bulk Dirac fermion with $c \lesssim -1/2$ and $(-,+)$ boundary conditions, that is described in the CFT with a left-handed source, the massless composite fermion zero mode $\psi_L^{(0)}$ must decouple because there can be no massless states. Since there is no coupling to the left-handed source a new elementary state $\chi_R^{(0)}$ must appear which pairs up with $\psi_L^{(0)}$ to form a massive Dirac state [17]. Consequently, since the new right-handed state is elementary it will also contribute to the running above the TeV scale.

So, for $c \lesssim -1/2$, consider the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ hypermultiplet pairs $(Q_2(-,+), Q_2^c(+,-))$ and $(L_2(-,+), L_2^c(+,-))$. The lowest lying fermion will be a Dirac state which consists of a composite Weyl fermion from the $(-,+)$ field married to an elementary Weyl fermion from the $(+,-)$ field. The elementary fermion will thus contribute to the running. Note that by supersymmetry there is also an elementary complex scalar, but it will receive a large supersymmetry breaking mass from the UV brane, and therefore does not contribute to the low energy running of the gauge couplings. The remaining $\mathcal{N} = 2$ hypermultiplets of the $SU(5)$ gauge multiplet with $c \lesssim -1/2$ are $(d_2^c(+,+), d_2(-,-))$, $(u_2^c(+,+), u_2(-,-))$ and $(e_2^c(+,+), e_2(-,-))$. In this case the corresponding zero mode fields are all composite and do not contribute to the running above the TeV (or compositeness) scale. Thus, with respect to the usual MSSM contribution to the gauge coupling running this means that we subtract the contribution of u_2^c, d_2^c and e_2^c, and include an extra fermion contribution from Q_2^c and L_2^c to the running. For the differential running of the gauge couplings this is effectively equivalent to subtracting twice the contribution of u_2^c, d_2^c and e_2^c, since complete $SU(5)$ multiplets do not change the differential running.

3 Analysis of gauge coupling unification

Successful gauge coupling unification relies on all three gauge couplings being within a few percent of the low energy observed values. In the setup we are considering here, with the bulk gauge symmetry broken by boundary conditions, the low energy gauge couplings, g_a are given by

$$\frac{1}{g_a^2(p)} = \frac{\pi R}{g_5^2} + \frac{1}{g_{Ba}^2(\mu)} + \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\Delta_a(p,\mu) \ , \tag{12}$$

where μ is a subtraction scale, g_{Ba} are boundary couplings, and Δ_a are the one-loop corrections. The first term in (12) is the contribution from the tree-level gauge coupling g_5 in the bulk. This contribution is universal because SU(5) is not broken in the bulk. Since $SU(5)$ is broken on the UV brane the UV boundary coupling encodes unknown $SU(5)$-violating contributions. This would seem to imply that there are no predictions for the low energy couplings. However, using NDA it can be shown that the $SU(5)$-violating contributions are sub-dominant compared to the one-loop contributions Δ_a [18]. In fact this is ensured by choosing $\mu \simeq \Lambda$, where Λ is the scale where the theory is effectively strongly coupled [19, 20]. In this way the boundary coupling contains no large logarithmns since $g_{Ba}(\Lambda) \simeq 4\pi$. Thus, given that the universal tree-level coupling $\pi R/g_5^2 \simeq \mathcal{O}(1)$ the successful prediction of the low energy couplings is not lost. The dominant contribution will arise from the logarithmically enhanced terms of Δ_a.

The large logarithmns that arise in Δ_a can be calculated by using the bulk zero-mode Green functions [21]. However, these expressions cannot be extrapolated beyond the TeV scale, since the effective field theory breaks down. Instead, we can interpret the large logarithmns as arising from the running of the Planck brane-brane correlator down to low energy [20]. Of course, at energies below the TeV scale the zero-mode Green functions and Planck correlators will agree at the leading log level, but only the Planck brane-brane correlator can make sense all the way up to high energies. At the leading log level the generic form of Δ^a is

$$\Delta^a(p,\Lambda) = b^a \log\frac{\Lambda}{p} + SU(5) \text{ universal} \ , \tag{13}$$

where b^a are the one-loop β-function coefficients of the particles that contribute to the running. Since we can safely neglect the non-universal boundary coupling contributions in Eq.(12), we can eliminate the universal piece and the scale Λ to obtain the low energy prediction at $p = M_Z$, namely

$$B = \frac{b_3 - b_2}{b_2 - b_1} = 0.717 \pm 0.008 \ , \tag{14}$$

where the error is due to the experimental determination of the low energy couplings. In the 4D CFT picture the one-loop bulk zero mode Greens functions in Ref. [21] can

be interpreted as two-loop contributions involving CFT states. Thus, by expanding the bulk expressions in p/T we can obtain some of the NLO corrections in the CFT.

3.1 Gauge sector

Let us now calculate the gauge coupling contributions in the partly supersymmetric model. In the gauge sector the zero-mode contribution from the unbroken gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ only arises from the gauge bosons, since the gauginos have decoupled below the Planck scale. Using the expressions in Ref. [21] we obtain for $\mathcal{V}^a_{++} = (V^a_\mu(+,+), S^a(-,-))$

$$\Delta^a(\mathcal{V}_{++}) = T_a(\mathcal{V}_{++}) \left[-\frac{11}{3} \ln \frac{k}{p} + \frac{3}{2}\pi kR + \ln 2kR \right] \ , \tag{15}$$

where $p \lesssim T$ and $T_a(\mathcal{V}_{++})$ is the Dynkin index. For $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ we have $T_a(\mathcal{V}_{++}) = (0, 2, 3)$ and only the zero mode gauge fields contribute a large logarithmn, which can be thought of as logarithmic running from momenta $p \lesssim T$ up to the scale k. The $\pi kR (= \ln \frac{k}{T})$ contribution in (15) arises from nonanalytic operators in the bulk like $\sqrt{\mathcal{R}}FF$ [19]. In the holographic picture this corresponds to the calculable part of the NLO CFT correction. We will see that since the bulk preserves the $SU(5)$ gauge symmetry the total contributions of this form will be universal. For the broken generators, we find that for $p \lesssim T$ and $\mathcal{V}^A_{-+} = (V^A_\mu(-,+), S^A(+,-))$

$$\Delta^a(\mathcal{V}_{-+}) = T_a(\mathcal{V}_{-+}) \left[\frac{3}{2}\pi kR + \ln \frac{2}{\pi} \right] \ . \tag{16}$$

In particular notice that there are no large logarithmn contributions consistent with the fact that there are no elementary fields in $\mathcal{V}^A_{-+}$. There is also a πkR contribution arising from the nonanalytic bulk operators. Using the fact that $T_a(\mathcal{V}_{-+}) = (5, 3, 2)$ the total contribution from the gauge supermultiplet $\mathcal{V}$ is

$$\Delta^a(\mathcal{V}) = b^a_{\mathcal{V}} \left[\ln \frac{k}{p} - \frac{1}{3} \ln(\pi kR) \right] + \frac{15}{2}\pi kR + 5 \ln \frac{2}{\pi} \ , \tag{17}$$

where

$$b^a_{\mathcal{V}} = (0, -\frac{22}{3}, -11) \ . \tag{18}$$

Notice that the first term in (17) represents the contribution from the elementary gauge boson zero modes. There is no corresponding contribution from the gaugino zero-modes because they have decoupled at low energies due to the high-scale supersymmetry breaking. In addition we have neglected the threshold effects arising from supersymmetry breaking, which should be comparable to those in the MSSM.

The second term in (17) represents a two-loop effect in the CFT which is not negligible because the source coupling to the current operator in the CFT is marginal. In the CFT picture the term $\ln(\pi kR) = \ln\ln\frac{k}{T}$ can be written as a double logarithmn. To see this term as a two-loop effect consider, in particular, a one-loop gauge boson diagram where one of the gauge boson propagators is corrected by the CFT. By using the expression for the corrected propagator in Ref. [6], the amplitude of this two-loop CFT diagram then becomes

$$\int d^4p \; \frac{1}{p^2 \ln\frac{p}{k}} \; \frac{1}{p^2} \sim \ln\ln\frac{p}{k} \; , \tag{19}$$

which for $p \simeq T$ has the appropriate form. Furthermore there are other two-loop contributions arising from 3-point and 4-point vertex corrections. By invoking Ward identities these contributions are related to the above corrected gauge boson propagator contribution. Thus, the $\ln(\pi kR)$ term in (17) represents the total from each of these contributions. Also as expected we see that the πkR contribution in (17) is universal.

3.2 Higgs sector

In the Higgs sector $\mathcal{H}_{++} = (H_2(+,+), H_2^c(-,-))$ (and similarly for $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{++}$), with $c_H \lesssim -1/2$ there are no large logarithmic contributions from the zero-mode doublets because all these fields are composite. However since the expression Δ^a is for $p \lesssim T$ there is a small contribution arising from the running below the scale T from both the Higgs and Higgsino, given by

$$\Delta^a(\mathcal{H}_{++}) = T_a(\mathcal{H}_{++}) \left[\ln\frac{T}{p} + c_H\pi kR + \ln\pi(\frac{1}{2} - c_H)\right] \; , \tag{20}$$

where $T_a(\mathcal{H}_{++}) = (3/10, 1/2, 0)$. This is consistent with the fact that for $c_H \lesssim -1/2$ the zero mode is composite and does not contribute to the running above the compositeness scale T. There are also terms arising from bulk operators, but again these will be universal. In the presence of supersymmetry breaking on the UV brane there are mass threshold effects for the Higgs and Higgsino which are not included in (20). Since we are mainly interested in the large log behaviour of Δ^a we will not consider these small effects further.

However the triplet Higgs hypermultiplets $\mathcal{H}_{-+} = (H_3(-,+), H_3^c(+,-))$ (and similarly for $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{-+}$), have $(\mp,\pm)$ boundary conditions and as explained earlier the lowest lying fermion state is a massive Dirac state with mass m_{-+} that consists of a composite fermion pairing with an elementary fermion. There is no running for momenta below m_{-+}, but for $m_{-+} \lesssim p \lesssim T$ we obtain

$$\Delta^a(\mathcal{H}_{-+}) = T_a(\mathcal{H}_{-+}) \left[\frac{2}{3}\ln\frac{k}{p} + \ln\frac{T}{p} + c_H\pi kR + + \ln 2\pi(c_H^2 - \frac{1}{4})\right] \; , \tag{21}$$

and similarly for $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$, where $T_a(\mathcal{H}_{-+}) = (1/5, 0, 1/2)$. The hybrid nature of the Dirac fermion zero-mode can be seen from the first two terms in (21). In the first term only an elementary Weyl fermion contributes a large logarithmn since the elementary scalar partner receives a large supersymmetry-breaking mass and decouples from the low energy spectrum. The second term shows the contribution from both the scalar and fermion composite triplets whose running stops at the compositeness scale T. Thus, combining (20) and (21), the total Higgs contribution for $c_H \lesssim -1/2$ and $m_{-+} \lesssim p \lesssim T$ is

$$\Delta^a(\mathcal{H}+\bar{\mathcal{H}}) = b^a_{\mathcal{H}+\bar{\mathcal{H}}}\left[\ln\frac{k}{p} + \ln(-2c_H - 1)\right] + \ln\frac{T}{p} + c_H\pi kR + \ln\pi(\frac{1}{2} - c_H)\ , \quad (22)$$

where the two elementary triplet Weyl Higgsinos from both Higgs hypermultiplets $\mathcal{H}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ contribute an amount

$$b^a_{\mathcal{H}+\bar{\mathcal{H}}} = \left(\frac{4}{15}, 0, \frac{2}{3}\right)\ . \quad (23)$$

3.3 Matter sector

For the bulk matter the first two generations always have $c_{\mathbf{5}_i}, c_{\mathbf{10}_i} \gtrsim 1/2$, and consequently all the zero modes are elementary and localised towards the Planck brane. The scalar zero modes (squarks and sleptons) will decouple at low energies because they feel the high-scale supersymmetry breaking, and so only the zero-mode fermions will give rise to a large logarithmic contribution. Thus, for a standard model fermion generation I with $c \gtrsim 1/2$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^a(\mathbf{5}_i^{(I)} + \mathbf{10}_i^{(I)}) &= \frac{4}{3}\ln\frac{k}{p} + T_a(\mathbf{5}_{i++})\ln(c_{\mathbf{5}_i} - \frac{1}{2}) + T_a(\mathbf{10}_{i++})\ln(c_{\mathbf{10}_i} - \frac{1}{2}) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}(c_{\mathbf{5}_i} + 3c_{\mathbf{10}_i})\pi kR\ , \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $i = 1, 2$ and $T_a(\mathbf{5}_{i++})(T_a(\mathbf{10}_{i++}))$ is the Dynkin index of the $(+,+)$ fields in $\mathbf{5}_i(\mathbf{10}_i)$. The first term in (24) is the usual $SU(5)$ universal contribution from one generation of standard model fermions. The second and third terms are higher-order nonuniversal contributions, while the last term is another universal contribution.

On the other hand the third generation is assumed to be partly composite. Only the zero mode fermions in $L_1(+,+)$ and $Q_1(+,+)$ will contribute to the running since $b^c_2(+,+)$, $t^c_2(+,+)$ and $\tau^c_2(+,+)$ are composite. In addition the hypermultiplets L_2 and Q_2 with $c_{\mathbf{5}_2}, c_{\mathbf{10}_2} \lesssim -1/2$ and $(\mp,\pm)$ boundary conditions have zero-mode Dirac fermion states. The Dirac fermion state again contains an elementary Weyl fermion which contributes a large logarithmn to the running. In this case we find

$$\Delta^a(\mathbf{5}_i^{(3)} + \mathbf{10}_i^{(3)}) = b^a_{(3)}\ln\frac{k}{p} + \frac{4}{3}\ln\frac{T}{p} + \frac{1}{2}(c_{\mathbf{5}_i} + 3c_{\mathbf{10}_i})\pi kR$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\ln(\frac{1}{2}-c_{\mathbf{5}_2})+3\ln(\frac{1}{2}-c_{\mathbf{10}_2}) \\
&+T_a(\mathbf{5}_{1++})\ln(c_{\mathbf{5}_1}-\frac{1}{2})(-c_{\mathbf{5}_2}-\frac{1}{2}) \\
&+T_a(\mathbf{10}_{1++})\ln(c_{\mathbf{10}_1}-\frac{1}{2})(-c_{\mathbf{10}_2}-\frac{1}{2})\ , \qquad (25)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
b^a_{(3)}=\left(\frac{8}{15},\frac{8}{3},\frac{4}{3}\right)\ . \qquad (26)
$$

In (25) we clearly see the differential running effect in the first term arising from the elementary fermion zero modes. The second term represents the composite fermion zero modes which stop running at the compositeness scale T, with the expected β-function coefficient from the **5** and **10** representations of $SU(5)$. Note that we have assumed that the corresponding scalar partners receive masses at the scale T and therefore their contribution is not included in the second term.

3.4 The total contribution

If we now add up all the Δ^a contributions (17), (22), (24) and (25) arising from the elementary states in the model then at the leading log level we obtain the total contribution

$$
\Delta^a=b^a_{total}\ln\frac{k}{p}+SU(5)\text{ universal}\ , \qquad (27)
$$

where

$$
b^a_{total}=\left(\frac{52}{15},-2,-\frac{19}{3}\right)\ . \qquad (28)
$$

These values of the β-function coefficients gives $B=0.793$ which is approximately within 10% of the experimental value (14). This compares with the Standard Model with no Higgs contribution (as in the original RS1 model) which gives $B=0.5$, a 40% discrepancy. Remarkably, the contribution from the partly composite third generation fermion sector has restored the low energy prediction to a level that can be realistically explained by threshold and higher-loop effects. The unification scale occurs at $\simeq 10^{16}$ GeV, which is similar to the usual MSSM, and the value of the unified coupling $\alpha_{GUT}\sim\mathcal{O}(1)$.

4 Other possible models

We argued earlier that it is natural to have the third generation be part elementary and part composite. This was primarily motivated by the fact that we would like the

extra dimensions to explain the Yukawa coupling hierarchies. However if we relax this condition and introduce small parameters for the Yukawa couplings, as is usually done in the supersymmetric standard model, then there are many more possibilities for which fermions can be composite. In fact, one can achieve unification at the leading log level that is just as good as the MSSM. Of course we have implicitly assumed all along that we can arbitrarily vary the bulk mass parameter c. However precision electroweak data can limit the range of allowed c parameters if the Kaluza-Klein mass scale is less than several TeV [22]. In order to explore the complete parameter space of models with partly supersymmetric grand unification we will assume that the Kaluza-Klein mass scale is heavy enough so that c is not constrained. This means that in these models there is a little hierarchy problem as in the MSSM.

To explore the most possibilities we need to generalise the parity assignments of the fields. In the simple Z_2 orbifold where the boundary conditions were chosen to break $SU(5)$ down to the standard model gauge group on the UV brane the parity assignments were restricted. In the **10** representation the u^c and e^c parity assignments are always opposite those of Q. However, one can always introduce extra fermion states on the boundaries that marry the unwanted zero modes so that only one field in each **10** has $(+,+)$ boundary conditions. Thus we can generalise to three **10** representations for each generation with parity assignments

$$\mathbf{10}_1 = Q_1(+,+) + t_1^c(-,+) + \tau_1^c(-,+) \ , \tag{29}$$

$$\mathbf{10}_2 = Q_2(-,+) + t_2^c(+,+) + \tau_2^c(-,+) \ , \tag{30}$$

$$\mathbf{10}_3 = Q_3(-,+) + t_3^c(-,+) + \tau_3^c(+,+) \ , \tag{31}$$

where $\mathbf{10}_i^c$ have the opposite parity assignments. This then enables one to introduce the bulk mass parameter $c_{\mathbf{10}_i}$ for each $(+,+)$ field in the **10**. In this way we can always achieve any combination of part elementary and part composite zero modes. If we first just restrict to the third generation then we obtain two other solutions that are within approximately 10% of the experimental value. So assuming that the gauge and Higgs sector are exactly as before, the first solution has only $c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{5}_2}, c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_2} \lesssim -1/2$ in the matter sector corresponding to t_R and b_R composite. The β-function coefficient is $b = (64/15, -2, -19/3)$ leading to a value $B = 0.691$ and a unification scale of $\approx 10^{15}$ GeV. The second solution has $c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_2}, c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_3} \lesssim -1/2$, corresponding to t_R and τ_R composite. In this case $b = (22/5, -4/3, -5)$ with $B = 0.639$, and the unification scale is near 10^{16} GeV. In both cases threshold effects and higher-loop effects are needed to account for the 10% difference with the experimental value.

Finally we consider more exotic possibilities by allowing fermions in the first two generations to be composite. A scan of all possible combinations of composite and elementary fermions gives many possibilities that are within 10% of the experimental value for B. Of course not all of these solutions are theoretically compelling. However one feature that follows from allowing part of the first or second gener-

ation to be composite is that the unification scale can be near the Planck scale. An example is $c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_2}, c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_3}, c^{(2)}_{\mathbf{10}_3} \lesssim -1/2$, corresponding to t_R, τ_R and μ_R composite with $b = (23/5, -1/3, -4)$. The unification scale is interestingly near 10^{18} GeV and $B = 0.743$ is already quite precise at the leading log level. A second representative example has c_R, s_R, t_L, t_R, b_R composite with $c^{(2)(3)}_{\mathbf{5}_2}, c^{(2)(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_2}, c^{(3)}_{\mathbf{10}_1} \lesssim -1/2$. In this case $b = (77/15, -5/3, -20/3)$ with $B = 0.735$, but the unification scale is lower $\approx 10^{13}$ GeV. Of course threshold and higher-loop effects are not included in these examples. These are only a small sample of the many permutations of elementary and composite fields, but it is curious to find phenomenologically viable solutions.

5 Conclusion

We have shown that the desirable features of the MSSM such as a natural solution to the hierarchy problem, gauge coupling unification and a dark matter candidate can be incorporated into a partly supersymmetric grand unified model without inheriting the flavour, CP and gravitino/moduli problems characteristic of the MSSM. In the partly supersymmetric model all superpartners except those associated with the Higgs sector are superheavy. Grand unification is achieved not from the gauginos and Higgsinos, which no longer contribute to the running, but instead from the partly elementary standard model matter which forms incomplete $SU(5)$ multiplets. Using a one-loop bulk calculation which corresponds to two-loops in the CFT we have shown that gauge coupling unification is achieved within 10% of the experimental value. This was obtained for a two Higgs doublet model, where the $SU(5)$ gauge symmetry is broken by boundary conditions. The parities of the matter fields are then restricted by the $SU(5)$ breaking on the orbifold and unification is achieved with a composite τ_R, b_R and t_R.

It should be emphasized that the idea of having partly elementary standard model matter that contributes to the differential running of gauge couplings is quite general, and there exist other possibilities of grand unification with partly composite fermions. We briefly considered the first and second generations to be partly composite as well as choosing more general boundary conditions for the matter fields. In some cases this allowed the gauge coupling unification to become more precise at the leading log level and also allowed the unification scale to be near the Planck scale. This new class of models with part composite and part elementary fields contains many desirable features and offers new possibilities for gauge coupling unification.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank K. Agashe, N. Arkani-Hamed, K. Choi, A. Pomarol and R. Sundrum for useful discussions. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the hospitality of the CERN Theory Division and the Aspen Center for Physics where part of this work was done. This research was supported in part by a Department of Energy grant DE-FG02-94ER40823 at the University of Minnesota, a grant from the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, and an award from Research Corporation.

References

[1] T. Gherghetta and A. Pomarol, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 085018 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0302001].

[2] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9905221].

[3] M. A. Luty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 141801 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205077].

[4] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9711200]; E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802150]; S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 105 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802109].

[5] N. Arkani-Hamed, M. Porrati and L. Randall, JHEP **0108**, 017 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0012148]; R. Rattazzi and A. Zaffaroni, JHEP **0104**, 021 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0012248]; M. Perez-Victoria, JHEP **0105**, 064 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105048].

[6] A. Pomarol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4004 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0005293].

[7] W. D. Goldberger and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 125011 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0208060].

[8] K. Agashe, A. Delgado and R. Sundrum, Annals Phys. **304**, 145 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212028].

[9] T. Gherghetta and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. B **602**, 3 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0012378].

[10] W. D. Goldberger, Y. Nomura and D. R. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 075021 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0209158].

[11] K. Agashe, R. Contino, and R. Sundrum, to appear.

[12] T. Gherghetta and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. B **586**, 141 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0003129].

[13] Y. Kawamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **105**, 999 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0012125].

[14] L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 055003 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0103125].

[15] A. Hebecker and J. March-Russell, Nucl. Phys. B **613**, 3 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0106166].

[16] R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 045025 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0106190].

[17] R. Contino and A. Pomarol, arXiv:hep-th/0406257.

[18] Z. Chacko, M. A. Luty and E. Ponton, JHEP **0007**, 036 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9909248]; Y. Nomura, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 085036 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0108170].

[19] R. Contino, P. Creminelli and E. Trincherini, JHEP **0210**, 029 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0208002].

[20] W. D. Goldberger and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 125012 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0303158].

[21] K. w. Choi and I. W. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 045005 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0208071].

[22] K. Agashe, A. Delgado, M. J. May and R. Sundrum, JHEP **0308**, 050 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0308036].